

particularly deadly forms of cancer. If successful, the treatment will be a game-changer for so many of these people with these two types of cancer.

Now, while John is not around to see the culmination of his life work because he passed away in 2009 at the age of 64, I don't only trust, I know that John is seeing what is going on today. And I am so happy to be here and be able to talk about the Kanzius Research Center.

Some of the people are in the gallery actually: my good friend, Mark Neidig, who is the executive director; board president, Maryann Yochim; and D.C. board member, Debra Thornton, to name a few. Again, an exceptional American.

WINDS OF CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today, Oregon begins a campaign that may turn the corner, once and for all, on our illogical, ill-advised approach to marijuana.

We have reached a critical point, where, over the last 40 years, a misguided policy of prohibition has patently failed. It simply doesn't work. It criminalizes behavior that most Americans feel should be legal. It costs taxpayers billions of dollars a year in the futile enforcement of prohibition. It feeds billions more into the coffers of drug cartels, which destabilize Mexico while they terrorize Central American countries, sending tens of thousands of children fleeing to our borders.

Imagine a situation so desperate that a parent would send a child on a treacherous journey, thousands of miles away.

The current policy undermines the credibility of government drug prevention programs. How do we expect people to respect an authority that pretends marijuana is more dangerous than methamphetamine or cocaine, that cannot answer the simple question: Has anybody ever died of a marijuana overdose?

Why respect an agency that wastes time and money that should be spent on drugs that are much more deadly and addictive?

The winds of change are blowing through the Capitol. We have seen, in the recent weeks, we have had five consecutive victorious votes on the House floor to have a more rational policy.

But the real leadership is at the State level. Forcing the issue are 23 States and the District of Columbia, where, now, over a million patients have access to medical marijuana, often in programs authorized by the voters.

In 2012, voters in Colorado and Washington both legalized adult use and have now started commercial markets, in Washington State just this month.

The campaign in Oregon is going to be key. It is a carefully-drawn statute which will be considered by the voters.

Now, make no mistake, the one-size-fits-all prohibition fanatics will be out in force, and we will hear about any hiccups in the neighboring State of Washington, largely blown out of proportion.

But we are going to hear everybody talk about their legitimate concern for keeping marijuana out of the hands of children. We all agree that young brains should not be subjected to marijuana. But, frankly, this is one of the biggest failures of our current program of prohibition.

We have a huge underground, shadow market. No one thinks that a 12-year old has a harder time getting a joint than a case of beer. Nobody checks ID. No one has a license to lose.

The success in Oregon will usher in, I think, a new era where the States have the right to regulate marijuana, just like alcohol. There will be more money for things we care about, like education, drug treatment, and drug enforcement, to keep and protect our children.

The failure of the current Federal prohibition is obvious. I am hopeful that voters in Oregon can help usher in this new era of regulation for adults and protections for children.

I think it is going to be a fascinating public policy debate.

□ 1030

WATERS OF THE U.S.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory attack on our economy and way of life in central and northwestern Pennsylvania has been growing for some time.

In recent months, the EPA moved forward with an egregious power grab to redefine the Agency's jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act through a new proposed rule commonly known as the Waters of the United States.

In Pennsylvania, agriculture is our number one industry. As in other parts of the country, our farmers and ranchers know that clean air, clean water, and being good stewards of the environment in which they live and work is of fundamental importance to their livelihoods.

Despite local prerogatives and successful State and regional initiatives to protect our natural resources, the Federal Government, once again, has chosen to undercut these efforts with punitive Federal regulations.

In March, the EPA issued the Waters of the U.S. proposal, explaining that the rule expands neither Federal authorities, nor the amount of water or land under the Agency's jurisdiction.

Well, the EPA has argued the action is necessary to eliminate ambiguity over which bodies of water are jurisdictional under the law. Unfortunately,

this is a far cry from the truth. In reality, the EPA's plan represents an unprecedented expansion of Federal power that will harm our economy and erode the rights of both States and private landowners.

Enacted in 1972, the Clean Water Act was created as a partnership between the States and the EPA in order to better manage identified pollution sources through a range of pollution control programs, such as setting wastewater standards.

The scope of the law is limited to navigable waters, and for the first time, it made it unlawful to discharge any pollutants into these bodies, unless a permit was obtained.

The law was never intended to impinge upon States' authority as the primary managers of water resources within their borders. The law was never intended to regulate small, non-contiguous bodies of water, such as streams, ditches, ponds, and creek beds, which would impose unnecessary burdens on economic activity. Unfortunately, that is exactly what the EPA has proposed.

Despite Supreme Court rulings interpreting the regulatory scope of the Clean Water Act more narrowly than what the Federal Government has asserted, the EPA's new rule moves in the opposite direction.

In fact, essentially all waters in the country under the EPA's proposed rule could potentially be subject to regulation and permitting approval by the Federal Government.

The Obama administration and the EPA have argued the rule is intended to eliminate ambiguity and offer greater protections for States, farmers, and landowners when, in fact, it will create new regulatory burdens, more ambiguity, and less certainty.

EPA Chief Gina McCarthy earlier this month characterized the growing opposition to the Waters of the U.S. rule—which has come from both Republicans and Democrats—as “ludicrous” and “silly” and recently summarized the backlash as a “growing list of misunderstandings.”

Madam Speaker, it is no misunderstanding. EPA's new Waters of the U.S. rule is a historic power grab that poses a fundamental threat to our economy and way of life in Pennsylvania and for communities across the country.

Unfortunately, the only thing ludicrous is how the EPA continues to believe a punitive one-size-fits-all approach to environmental stewardship is the only way forward.

RECOGNIZING BOY SCOUT TROOP

772

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group from my district, Boy Scout Troop 772 of Fort Pierce, Florida.

Troop 772 was established last year at Dan McCarty Middle School as a community effort to keep young men in the area engaged in positive after-school activities by providing support and guidance. Troop 772 is no ordinary Boy Scout troop. It is much more.

For too long, Fort Pierce has been plagued by gangs, by rampant violent crime that has taken the lives of neighbors and colleagues, friends and loved ones. For the young men of Troop 772, this violence isn't just something they see on the television or hear about in the abstract. It is the terrifying reality they face every day of their lives.

I want to share what these Scouts have said about what it is like in their community in their own words: "I want you to get rid of gangs in my community. I want to be able to wear any colors I want without having to change. It would be good to go a week or so without hearing a gunshot. We will be better if people stop fighting."

When I hear this, I am both saddened and outraged. No one—let alone our youth—should have to live in constant fear of violence, but at the same time, I am hopeful. What brings me hope for Fort Pierce is Troop 772. Troop 772 was born out of violence, but in them, I see a solution to that violence.

When Troop 772 was just an idea, there was a lot of skepticism. There was skepticism about whether the troop could move these young men away from the violence and into their community, but the troop, the community, and, in particular, the adult leadership of the troop has given much-needed support to these young men.

They have been a constant presence in the lives of these Scouts at a time when they need them the most, at a time when others in their community would only do them harm. It is clear that this troop will help make the community a safer and better place to live.

These young men who had struggled or had bad behavior are starting to thrive as a result of Troop 772 and the positive environment it provides.

Earlier this year, I was privileged to visit with the troop and see their hard work and dedication firsthand while they worked on a local environmental project.

It is this kind of hard work and commitment that will help these young men succeed and become the leaders of tomorrow. It is this kind of hard work and commitment that has brought Troop 772 to Washington today to receive their Citizenship in the Nation merit badges. It is truly an honor to recognize them with this major accomplishment and the dedication that has brought them here.

I also want to take a moment to recognize all of those individuals who helped them reach this monumental point today. I want to thank Scoutmaster Rusty Hines and Assistant Scoutmasters Dan Hafner and Bob Taylor for teaching Troop 772 leadership and Scouting skills, as well as for making the Scouting experience so enjoyable for these young men.

Thanks to all of the members of the community who helped make this trip of a lifetime possible and State Representative Larry Lee, Jr., and St. Lucie County Commissioner Kim Johnson for showing their continued support of these young men by joining them here today.

Of course, I also want to thank Scott Van Duzer, who made Troop 772 a reality. Through his Van Duzer Foundation, his dedication to helping these young men and bettering our community is unwavering. Our community will be forever grateful for all of their work, which has touched so many lives and inspired an entire community.

Lastly and most importantly, I want to thank the Scouts of the troop. Our community is so proud of what they have achieved, individually and together. This troop is a testament to what can be accomplished when youth are given the chance to succeed.

ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT AGAINST ERIC HOLDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, last November, I filed Articles of Impeachment against our Attorney General, Eric Holder. This was a serious action. I am not happy that I had to do it.

The trust of the American people in their government is at an alltime low. They wonder: Where is the Constitution? Is it still law? Is it alive?

It is still law. It is still alive. I took a sacred oath to defend it. All of my colleagues took that same oath. Mr. Holder took that oath. Sadly, he has broken that oath many times.

He has a long record of enforcing laws he likes and ignoring laws he doesn't like. The oath he took doesn't give him that choice. He is the number one law enforcement official in America.

We are having an immigration crisis on our border with Mexico. Kids are coming across in record numbers. Next year, our Border Patrol thinks that 150,000 kids will cross illegally. That is roughly the same number of Allied Forces that invaded Normandy on D-day.

We have laws on the books to stop this crisis, and yet Mr. Holder won't enforce those laws. Instead, he made up new rules that refuse to deport people who have come here illegally. He chose to break our laws. He chose to break his oath.

The Internal Revenue Service has been using our Tax Code to harass Americans because their political views oppose the administration's. The watchdog over the IRS begged Mr. Holder to investigate because crimes may have been committed within the IRS by senior officials. Mr. Holder chose not to investigate the IRS. He chose politics over our laws. He chose to break his oath.

Finally, Mr. Holder, under oath to tell the truth, told Congress that he

had no involvement in an operation against a reporter working for a network Mr. Holder didn't like, yet Mr. Holder's signature was on the paper approving that operation. He chose to break our laws. He chose to break his oath.

Hoping to remind Mr. Holder about his oath and his duty to enforce all of our laws, Congress held Mr. Holder in contempt in June of 2012. He made history, with two bipartisan votes holding him in contempt of Congress. Sadly, 2 years later, Mr. Holder continues to break his oath.

The only weapon Congress has for Federal officials who break their oath and our law is impeachment. I have 28 cosponsors of my resolution to impeach Mr. Holder. I ask my colleagues to remember that we are a Nation of laws.

Show the American people that our Constitution is alive and well—cosponsor H. Res. 411, Articles of Impeachment against Eric Holder.

THE BLAME BARACK OBAMA CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, we have a humanitarian crisis at our border that challenges the capacity of the United States of America to address it from both a resource perspective and from a compassionate perspective.

Tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors are seeking entry into this country, children who are fleeing extreme violence in the northern triangle countries of Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

Now, there are some in this institution who want to lay blame for this crisis at the feet of the Obama administration. This is not a surprising development because these individuals are members of the BBO caucus, the blame Barack Obama caucus.

Whenever anything happens in this country or in this world, they want to blame the President of the United States. Something goes wrong in Iraq, a war that was prosecuted, that was botched, that was mismanaged by the previous administration, the BBO caucus blames Barack Obama.

So we are seeing a similar phenomenon as it relates to this humanitarian crisis. First, they claim it was brought about by the President's decision related to deferred action connected to individuals falling into the DREAMer category.

□ 1045

But they failed to note that in order to be eligible for deferred action, you have to be in this country continuously since 2007. That claim has no basis in reality.

Then they say, well, the President refuses to enforce our Nation's immigration laws. How silly is that argument? Hundreds of thousands of individuals have been deported by the Obama administration each and every year in